DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 432 SP 025 441

AUTHOR Emmer, Edmund T.
TITLE Management Strategies in Elementary School Classrooms. R&D Rep. No. 6052.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 82
CONTRACT OB-NIE-G-80-0116-P2
NOTE 45p.; For a related document, see SP 025 440.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Discipline; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; *Learning Strategies; Student Behavior; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; Time on Task
IDENTIFIERS First Week of School

ABSTRACT

Teacher behaviors and activities related to varying levels of student engagement and disruption were examined in 41 elementary school classrooms. Teachers and their classes were observed for eight weeks at the beginning of the school year and from January to March to determine: (1) the relationships between management behaviors and two student behavior criteria for effective management (student engagement and disruption); (2) patterns of relationships and whether they varied for the two criteria; and (3) context effects, such as grade level differences. Beginning-of-the-year observation data from classes of more and less effective managers were compared to gain information about beginning-of-the-year behaviors and management success throughout the school year. Results identified a number of significant predictors of management success, especially in the areas of establishing classroom procedures, use of consequences, consistency, clarity of communication, and prompt handling of inappropriate behavior. Excerpts from narrative records illustrate teaching strategies of more and less effective teachers. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
O. H. Brown
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED251432

Management Strategies in Elementary School Classrooms

Edmund T. Emmer

R & D Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

(R&D Rep. No. 6052)

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

July 1982

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Education, Contract OB-NIE-G-80-0116, P2, Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the NIE and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Communication Services, R&DCTE, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

SP 025 441

Management Strategies in Elementary School Classrooms

Abstract

Teacher behaviors and activities related to varying levels of student engagement and disruption were examined in 41 elementary classrooms. Teachers and their classes were observed for 8 weeks at the beginning of the school year and from January to March. Several observation procedures were used to gather descriptive and quantitative data. Results identified a number of significant predictors of management success, especially in the areas of establishing classroom procedures, use of consequences, consistency, clarity of communication, and prompt handling of inappropriate behavior. Excerpts from narrative records are used to illustrate teacher strategies.

Management Strategies in Elementary School Classrooms

Edmund T. Emmer

Research on classroom management strategies and behaviors is important for two basic reasons: the centrality of management to the teacher's role (Doyle, 1979; Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975) and the consistent relationships found in the process-product research literature between various management behaviors and student learning gains (Good, 1979; Medley, 1977). Criteria for management effectiveness can be defined in terms of student behaviors such as engagement or on-task rates, cooperation, and low frequencies of inappropriate or disruptive behavior. When such criteria have been used, indicators of management capability have included withitness, overlapping, smoothness, group alerting, accountability, and seatwork variety and challenge (Kounin, 1970), higher amounts of teacher academic feedback and more substantive academic interaction (Filby, Note 1), continuity of the lesson's signal system (Kounin & Doyle, 1975), provision for structure during transitions (Arlin, 1979), and consistent use of consequences (Benowitz & Busse, 1976; Breuning, 1978). Context variables influence management also, with outcomes varying according to lesson formats (Good & Beckerman, 1978; Kounin & Gump, 1974), student socioeconomic status (Brophy & Evertson, 1976), heterogeneity of student ability in the class (Evertson, Sanford, & Emmer, 1981), and average ability level (Evertson, in press). Time of year also appears to be an important context, with the beginning of the year used in part for socialization of children into classroom settings (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). In the latter study, the Classroom Organization Study (COS), conducted in third grade classrooms, better managers appeared to focus their beginning-of-

year activities more on acquainting children with their system of rules and procedures, and they had a more differentiated set of procedures than poorer managers, i.e., their rules and procedures were better able to guide their students through the school day. In addition, the better managers had stronger instructional skills, including greater clarity in their directions and instruction.

The present paper seeks to extend the findings from the previously cited research by examining classroom management in 41 teachers' classrooms, ranging from Grade 1 to Grade 6. The study will examine the relationships between management behaviors identified in the COS and two student behavior criteria for effective management (student engagement and disruption). It will also consider whether patterns of relationships vary for the two different criteria and will examine some context effects such as grade level differences. Beginning-of-year observation data from classes of more- and less-effective managers will be compared to gain more information about beginning-of-year behaviors and management success throughout the school year. Extensive classroom narrrative data will be used to provide illustrations of management concepts and problem areas.

Methods

Data were gathered in 41 elementary school classrooms whose teachers were participating in a field experiment on management. In the experimental study, a treatment group of teachers (n = 23) received a manual and two workshops on management at the beginning of the school year. A control group (n = 18) received the manual and workshop later in the school year. The results of the experimental study are presented elsewhere (Emmer, Sanford, Evertson, Clements, & Martin, Note 2).

The 41 teachers were volunteers from 11 schools in two school districts. The range of prior teaching experience in the sample was from zero to 12 years, with a median of 3 years. The pupil populations served by the schools in the sample were varied, including several Title I schools. All schools were ethnically/racially mixed settings as the result of neighborhood integration or cross-town busing.

All teachers in the study were observed on the first day of the school year and, on the average, eight additional times during the first 8 weeks of school. Four additional observations were made during January to March. Observations were conducted for approximately 2 hours and about two-thirds of these were in the morning.

Observation instruments included frequency counts of students engaged in academic, procedural, or off-task behavior (student engagement rates, or SERs). These counts were made at 15-minute intervals throughout all observations. A second instrument was the Component Ratings (CRs) completed by the observer at the end of each observation. These ratings, using 5-point scales, assessed a variety of behaviors and characteristics, derived from a consideration of prior research on management, and analysis of management functions. Several additional scales called Addendum Component Ratings (AdCRs) were used during the first week. Another assessment procedure was a time log, which was a record of how time was used in the class throughout the observation. Sequence and duration of each time use category was preserved. At the end of the first 4 weeks of observations, observers provided a set of summary Observer Ratings of Teachers (ORT). Finally, observers took extensive notes describing classroom behavior and activities; the preparation of these notes was guided by an observer manual listing

areas of concern. At the completion of the observation, observers used their notes to dictate a narrative record which was subsequently typed. The record contains detailed descriptions of classroom events and activities and, when considered as a set for a given teacher, provides a fairly complete picture of life in that classroom. Subsequently, the set of narratives for a teacher was read and, using a narrative record analysis form (NR), readers assessed various teacher or student behaviors or characteristics using 5-point scales. In addition to these assessments, the narrative records provide a rich source of case study material and were useful in interpreting the results of the more quantitative analyses presented in this paper.

The reliability of variables was assessed by comparing pairs of observers assigned to the same teacher at different times, or by comparing pairs of narrative readers assigned to the same teacher. Unreliable variables (using the intraclass correlation technique and significance level of .05) were not used in the analyses.

Classroom management criteria used in this study are student engagement and disruptive behavior. Engagement rates were determined by frequency counts made by observers every 15 minutes during all observations. Students were counted as engaged if they were doing whatever was appropriate for the on-going classroom activity and were not obviously off-task. The engagement rate was defined as the percentage of students present who were coded as engaged. The amount of disruptive behavior was assessed using a 5-point rating scale at the end of each observation. Disruptive behavior refers to pupil behavior that interferes with instructional or work activities of the teacher or two or more other students. A rating of five was used to indicate a high frequency of

occurrence, that is, habitual behavior that was a constant problem for the teacher and other students. A mid-scale rating was used when behaviors occurred with moderate frequency, such as several on the average per hour and occasionally moderately or severely disruptive. A rating of two indicated one or two incidents per hour, usually mild. A rating of one was used to indicate the absence of such behavior. Data on the two management criteria and other observational variables were aggregated across all observations before analyses. Justification for aggregating across observations is based on the stability of the behavior variables. Table 1 shows the relationship between three student behaviors observed during the beginning of the year and the January-March period of observation. Beginning-of-year behaviors are quite predictive of mid-year behavior. The two management criteria used in this study, disruptive behavior and engagement rates, were correlated -.46 when data were aggregated across the year.

Results

In order to determine what teacher behavior variables were associated with better management results, correlations were computed between the dual management criteria of student engagement rates and level of disruption and teacher behavior variables on the CR, AdCR, NR, and ORT instruments. The CR, AdCR, and the management criterion variables were averaged across all observations before calculating the correlations. As indicated earlier, some of the teachers had received treatment materials as part of a field experiment. Therefore when the correlations were computed, the contributions to covariation associated with group membership were partialed out. Table 2 presents these correlations. In this table the variables from different instruments

are grouped according to the management area with which they are associated. A number of significant correlations were obtained and each major management area has one or more variables correlated at least moderately with one or both management criteria. In some cases the variables in a management area predict only one of the criteria or predict it better than the other criteria. The strongest (negative) predictors of disruptive behavior are appropriate general procedures and efficient small group procedures, stopping inappropriate behavior quickly, consistency, and clarity. The strongest predictors of student engagement are monitoring student behavior and understanding, student success, attention spans considered in lesson, appropriate pacing of lessons, efficient administrative routines, consistency, and clarity.

Additional analyses were undertaken to determine whether the patterns of correlation would be altered by particular context features such as grade level, average student ability level, or heterogeneity of students within classes. Standardized achievement scores were available from one school district and had been obtained during district-wide spring testing in 34 of the participating classes. In a number of cases, however, students in one teacher's class received reading and/or mathematics instruction in another teacher's class as part of team teaching arrangements. Consequently, full achievement data were not available for all of the students taught by each teacher. Despite this limitation, several different analyses were made with different sub-samples of classes, determined by the proportion of students in the class taught reading or mathematics by the observed teacher. To check for context effects, regression equations were computed in which grade level, the deviation of the class mean grade equivalent from the

expected score for that class (an indicator of class ability level), and the standard deviation of the class reading scores (an indicator of the spread of student ability levels within a class) were entered as predictors along with various teacher behavior variables. Student engagement rates and level of disruption were then used as criterion variables. In addition, interactions between context variables and teacher behaviors were also used in these equations. The results of these analyses indicated that the addition of these context variables and their interactions to the teacher behavior predictors usually did not improve the prediction of the management criteria. The number of significant increases in prediction obtained was no more than would be expected by chance, given the number of analyses. Consequently, for these data the context variables did not alter the pattern of relationships among teacher behaviors and management outcomes.

In order to determine what antecedent conditions existed for good or poor management later in the year, analyses were conducted of teacher and student behavior during the beginning-of-year observations. Using data from the four observations in the January to March time period, classes were ranked using the management criteria of engagement rates and level of disruption. Six classes with low combined rankings on these criteria were identified and then matched by grade level and school with six middle and high ranked classes. The three groups of classes had similar numbers of both primary and intermediate grades and were similar with respect to other features that might have affected management such as involvement in cross-town busing. During the January-March period, the highest ranked group of teachers (n = 6), labeled very effective (VE) managers, had mean student engagement rates

of 94.6% in all academic and procedural activities combined, and a mean level of disruption of 1.25, indicating a very low level of disruptive behavior. A second group, labeled effective (E) managers had scores on the management criteria of 91.1% and 1.43, respectively, during the same period of time. The third group, labeled less effective (LE) had criterion scores of 82.1% and 2.92. The latter mean for level of disruption indicated that such behavior occurred in these classrooms with moderate frequency--meaning several instances per hour on the average. Thus the subgroups differed in their management characteristics but mainly in the distinction between the LE group and the other two groups. It should be noted that the LE classes, while not effectively managed, were not grossly mismanaged in terms of the student behavior criteria.

The three groups of classes were compared on the CR and AdCR variables using analysis of variance from the two or three observations obtained in the first week of school. Table 3 shows the results of these analyses. In addition, the narrative records from the first four observations were reexamined and additional variables were coded. The new variables included the amount of time spent teaching rules, procedures, and consequences; the number of times consequences were presented or discussed with the students (a consequence was defined as a penalty or a reward contingent on specified student behavior); frequency of challenges (instances of students violating a rule or procedure in an obvious manner); desist events (instances of a teacher requesting or directing students to cease some behavior); and affective activities (e.g., get aquainted activities, activities that focused on student

feelings). Results of the analysis of these variables are presented in Table 4.

Taken together, the data presented in Tables 3 and 4 indicate that teachers with better managed classes later in the year had a more comprehensive and better taught system for rules, procedures, and consequences at the beginning of the year. They were also assessed as more consistent, dealing more promptly with inappropriate and disruptive behavior, and exhibiting greater clarity. Better managers spent more time teaching their system of rules and procedures; gave more explanation, feedback, and review of their system; used more appropriate general procedures, clear directions, more consequences; ignored inappropriate behavior less often; expressed feelings more frequently; and managed interruptions better.

Discussion

An examination of the patterns of correlation among the teacher behavior variables and the two management criteria indicated both similarities and differences. Classroom readiness and consequences variables predicted the extent of student engagement but not the amount of disruption. Some variables related to the teaching of rules and procedures during the first week of classes were correlated with level of disruptive behavior but not with student engagement. The clarity and consistency variables were good predictors of both management criteria. However, the other strong (negative) predictors of disruptive behavior were appropriate general procedures, efficient small group procedures, and stopping inappropriate behavior quickly; while the strongest predictors of student engagement were monitoring student understanding and behavior, student success, appropriate pacing of lessons, considera-

tion of student attention spans in lessons, and efficient administrative routines. These different patterns of best predictors suggest that student disruption is more likely if classroom activities lack the structure afforded by effective general and small group procedures, and if the teacher does not deal promptly with misbehavior to prevent it from intensifying or spreading. Student engagement, however, is less a function of the structuring activities of the teacher than of the degree to which the task demands of the lesson fit the students' capabilities and attentional characteristics. Most of the stronger predictors of student engagement indicate teacher skills in matching task demands to students.

When beginning-of-year behaviors were examined, a number of differences among the groups was noted. Teachers who were classified as better managers differed from the LE managers in the emphasis they placed on conveying expectations for appropriate and inappropriate behavior through teaching a system of procedures and consequences to their students. They were more consistent in their management of student behavior, gave clearer directions, were less likely to ignore inappropriate behavior, and they stopped disruption quickly. In these respects their behavior was similar to the pattern associated with effective management observed throughout the year. However, those behaviors that are the best predictors of student engagement (e.g., student success, appropriate pacing, etc.) did not discriminate significantly among the groups at the beginning of the year. These latter variables may not be as critical at the beginning of the year because the content is largely a review of objectives covered in earlier years and because the tasks required of students are usually easier. The

absence of differences on some of these variables that yielded significant correlations with student engagement in the full data set may be an indication of the presence of reciprocal effects over time. Teachers who initially do not provide adequate structure to prevent disruptive behavior may find their ability to instruct increasingly hampered by disruption as the year progresses. This may limit or prevent their use of activities or behaviors that promote student engagement and thus as the year progresses their assessments on related variables will diverge from those of more effective managers.

Establishing and Maintaining Appropriate Student Behavior

The results of the data analyses indicated that variables reflecting the teachers' efforts to communicate clear expectations and to employ them consistently were important in establishing appropriate student behavior. In order to clarify the nature of these expectations, the narrative records obtained throughout the year for teachers in the subsamples were reexamined. The focus of the reexamination was on the areas covered by the teachers' procedures and rules and on those aspects of management that posed major problems for the less effective teachers. In this discussion several excerpts will be provided illustrating more- and less-effective management practices. These excerpts have been selected to illustrate as many of the variables as possible.

Classes taught by less effective managers were characterized by high levels of inappropriate student behavior. The following excerpt from a fourth grade class illustrates how such behavior affects the flow of classroom activities. It also illustrates a number of teacher behaviors associated with management problems. The observation was made in early March and begins at 8:00 a.m.

The bell rings at 8:00. Three students are standing. The teacher pauses and then goes to the center front of the room. She says something about what she did yesterday that would cause all of these people to be absent or late (there are a number of empty desks in the room). The teacher goes on. She asks students what they liked about the field trip yesterday to the Natural Science Center. Several students raise their hands. She collects an answer from only one student. Then she asks a new question, "How many of you ever touched a snake before yesterday?" There is a show of hands. The teacher calls on about two students for comments. . . The teacher says, "Do you think of anything else about the field trip yesterday that you particularly liked?" She gets no response. There is already some inattention obvious as some students are not facing the teacher. Some are quietly conversing among themselves. The teacher waits but doesn't get an answer. She abandons the discussion with a comment to the girl who is still passing out papers to hurry up. At 8:02, the discussion dissolves. During the discussion, there were conversations going on between four students or more. At 8:03, students are in dead time as the teacher talks with some individuals. The paper passer has stopped now. At 8:03 the teacher goes to the front again and announces that today she will show them something new. The teacher says that she would like them to try it. The teacher's voice is low, and two students near the observer are talking loudly. The teacher ignores them and other students who are not paying attention. Two girls near the teacher are also talking. The teacher does not have the attention of most of the students, but she ignores this. She turns on the overhead projector. She has the attention and eye contact of a small group of students in the middle of the room near the front. At 8:05 the teacher puts an overhead transparency on the projector. The transparency has some cursive writing on it, and the teacher has purposely placed it with the wrong side down so that the writing is shown backwards. The teacher says that this demonstrates the slant that we use when we write in cursive. Two students by the observer are looking away from the teacher. Two other students walk into the room at this time. The students over at the far wall are quiet but they seem to be ignoring the teacher. One student goes to the closet. Another girl gets paper. One goes to the pencil sharpener. . . At 8:14 the teacher says, "Okay, enough of this. Let's try our K's again." A student says, "What?" The teacher says, "K." The teacher starts talking rapidly at the board about K's and makes a list of upper case and lower case K's on the board. The teacher has left behind most of the students because they are still interested working on the backward handwriting. Some have barely gotten started. The teacher stops after a while. She realizes that she has the attention of virtually no one. She stops and says, "Could I have your attention?" The students look at her and then she begins talking again. She turns her back to the students and writes K's on the board. The students mostly turn back to their own writing backwards efforts. Two more students make trips to

> the mirror to check their work. . . At 8:30 the teacher calls up students in the Panorama group. She says, "Panorama, Panorama, could you come up here with me a few minutes and talk about that story?" One of the Panorama students asks, "What story?" The teacher tells them, "The one about the glass jar." The student says, "We haven't read that yet." The teacher says, "Yes, we haven't read it yet. I know. Come up here and let's talk about some words for a minute." Three students in the Panorama group meet with the teacher at the front of the room at 8:31. The teacher writes some words on the blackboard: project, settle, and future. She goes over these words with the students, defining them and asking them to give examples. Many of the rest of the class at this point are either off task or in dead time. The observer has no way of knowing how many students are supposed to be working on the assignment that is written on the board. The teacher hasn't said anything to anyone. More get their books and start something. Two boys who have not acted like they were able to do much of anything yet spend some time looking at the dinosaur bulletin board behind the teacher's desk. Aaron sits with a clear desk, with seemingly nothing to do. One boy finishes the writing assignment and waits idly as if in dead time. . . The teacher hasn't said anything to anyone about the assignment on the board or any other assignment. One group of several students still works on the backwards writing assignment. They frequently make trips to the mirror to check their work.

Although no disruption is apparent in the preceding excerpt, frequent inattentiveness and off-task behavior were common. These were caused by a number of factors. The teacher did not have any established routine for beginning the day, and she did not have an effective procedure developed for handling late arriving students. The beginning and end of activities were not signaled by the teacher: She tended to leave students in one activity while she raced through the transition and into the next activity without getting the students' attention first. No coherent line of instruction is followed during the excerpt, and the teacher failed to clarify the purpose of any activity. The numerous inattentive students who left their seats implusively and wandered about the room received no feedback about their behavior and very little information about what they were supposed to do. Finally,

the teacher does not seem to monitor students very well to determine whether they are attending or whether they are engaged appropriately in the assigned activity.

Contrast these instructions and whole class procedures with those in the following excerpt taken from an effective sixth grade manager, who has routines and procedures established in many key areas.

> This class does not wait until school starts to begin their work. Almost all of the students are in their seats working at 7:57. . . The teacher says, "Three minutes before school officially starts. Okay, I've got the handwriting from last week for everybody except Robert and Joleen." She passes back this work, and the class is silent as individuals receive their papers. They continue to do the handwriting, which is always on the board, as students come in. The teacher speaks in Spanish to four students. The second bell rings at 8:02. A boy goes to the teacher, and she says, "David, sit down please because they can't see in back of you." A few students look up but otherwise it is very quiet. The teacher goes to her desk. Several students go up to the teacher, get an answer to a question, and then return to their seats. There is a bit of chatting now. The teacher says, "Okay, put your pencils down now. Be real quiet so you can listen for your name." . . . At 8:15, the teacher gets up and circulates about the room, helping different students with their work. She talks warmly to several students. She says, "Okay, David, come here for a second, please." David goes over to her. She talks with him for a few seconds, and then he sits down again. She evidently has given the students a rather large handwriting assignment. They are to write something three times each. They write the letter, C, and then write words that start with C. Some of these words are come, call, cat, cute, curl, cumbersome, and careless. They do M's and N's next. The teacher points out on the board the difference between these two letters. . . At 8:20 the teacher says, "Let's line up for math, please." Several students line up at the door and then leave for another classroom. Other students come into the room and sit down. The teacher waits for a moment and then says, "I'm waiting for Andre. Okay." The new students take their seats. At 8:23 she explains the assignment that she wants one group to do. They are to work with some geometric figures. She wants them to find the area of each figure. She reviews with them how to find the area of a figure. Then, she says, "Are there any questions?" Before moving on to the next group, the teacher makes sure that everyone in the first group understands the assignment. One boy asks a question. The teacher replies, "That's homework for today." A girl says something, and the teacher says, "Shh. Mary Jo, I haven't

called on you." There is absolute silence. The group gets e started, and the teacher goes over to the other group. . .

In contrast to the earlier excerpt, this teacher has an established routine for beginning the school day. Its use enables the teacher to complete administrative tasks at the same time that students work on their handwriting assignment. Late arriving students can easily make the transition into this activity with minimal assistance from the teacher. A number of other routines are in place in the class including lining up procedures, procedures for getting help from the teacher, and regulation of movement and out-of-seat behavior. Only a small amount of inappropriate behavior occurred, and the teacher either dealt with it directly or engaged students in other behavior quickly. The directions for procedures and assignments seem sufficiently clear and no confusion is noted.

The following excerpts, from an early February observation of a first grade teacher who was an excellent manager, provide examples from a primary grade setting. The first excerpt illustrates some different opening procedures from the preceding examples.

> Students and the teacher enter at 8:00. They are very quiet. The students enter in line, and they go over to the closet. They put up their coats and some go to the restroom. Others take down chairs and sit down. The teacher stands at her desk watching and doing paperwork. The room is very quiet, but the hall is a little noisy. The teacher puts graded papers on three students' desks. Now she calls for the students to bring their valentines up. She puts them in a bag. Four students come up to the teacher and stand there quietly. At 8:04 the teacher, after talking to these students, crosses to the restroom. She says, "You are taking too long." She helps some students take off their coats and hangs them up. More students take their seats. The teacher tells the class to take down the seats of the absent students. All students are either in line for the restroom or are quietly sitting at their seats. The teacher tells David to get out some handwriting paper, and he goes behind the screen and gets it. The teacher stands in front of her desk. She plays the xylophone which is on the table. The

students immediately stand up and say the Pledge. They sit down as soon as they finish. The teacher calls Rhonda to her desk and tells her to pass out some big pencils. A transition begins at 8:08. The teacher tells them that they have work to do on the board. She says that when they finish they may review their words, read an old story in their textbook, or use their skill boxes. But this is only after they finish the boardwork. The teacher asks Rhonda to explain the SRA boxes to a student who apparently is new after the boardwork is done. The teacher calls for pencils to be sharpened and seven students come up. The pencil sharpener is by the door. The teacher sharpens pencils for the students. A girl comes up. The teacher says, "Now when did I say I would explain it?" The girl smiles, mumbles, and then sits down. The teacher tells David, Andrew, and Derick that they are to stay here this morning (rather than go to another room for some lesson). The teacher says, "I gave you some work to do on your desks. You know what to do with it." The teacher tells Randy that he forgot paper for a whole table. He goes up to get it. Now the teacher tells Kenneth to finish the work from yesterday. She lays it on his desk. She tells him that he wasn't thinking and he smiles. The transition ends. The teacher says, "Group one and two, you are to unscramble the sentences on the left side of the board." These are as follows, (1) Tree is Sue's in kite the. (2) Took pie nine she bites of. (3) Cake mom my will a bake. The teacher says, "Group three and four, you may copy the sentences on the right side of the board and fill in the blanks with the word that I have written underneath. After you write it in, underline the word." These sentences are printed in very large letters on a lined board. The teacher uses the same kind of spacing as the students will on the paper. The teacher tells the classes she wants the papers done neatly. She wants one finger space between each word. She says, "Is that clear?" Most of the students chorally answer, "Yes." The teacher says, "You can start writing now but before you start to write think each sentence through. Unscramble it first." The teacher tells Roger to get some paper. A transition begins and ends at 8:17. Sandra raises her hand and the teacher tells her to put a book that she has in her hand in a basket by her desk. The teacher says, "Get started."

It is clear from this excerpt that these first grade children have learned a number of important management procedures including entering the room, using the bathroom, pencil sharpener rules, movement in the room, lining up, and responding to a signal (the xylophone). These procedures enable the teacher to begin the day quickly with pupils ready for instruction. In the excerpt the teacher began with some simple

activities and gave directions while the students were in a whole class format. These instructions seemed clear and students were able to begin promptly. The following excerpt is from the same teacher later in the morning and begins at 9:16 after the teacher had had students get out their math books.

> The teacher is still with the small group. The transition ends when the teacher says, "Group one, page . . ." "Group two, page . . ." The teacher bends over the center table and continues explaining. Then to the whole room she says, "Put your name and the date on the paper." The teacher moves to the group by the window where there are five students. The teacher says, "You sure are smart. You've already started." The teacher says, "Group two, to the round table." A transition begins and lasts for about one minute. The teacher continues explaining something to the center table. Now she tells Derick to get Jimmy a sheet of paper also. He gets one for himself and one for Jimmy. The teacher sits with the group at the round table and says to the class, "Do your work by yourself. No talking." The teacher tells Jimmy to put his head down. There are five students with the teacher. The transition ends. The teacher asks the group, "Now what did I say when I told you to come here? I didn't say anything about your reading books. Several of you brought your reading books." She looks at one student and says, "You even got up and went to your seat and came back. We were wasting time waiting on you. You don't need your reading books, only your math. You've got to listen." The teacher starts working with the group at 9:26. She begins to explain grouping. She explains to them in simple and clear terms. She talks to them about stacks of 10 as opposed to things by themselves or in units of one. Four students are at the SRA box. Rhonda appears to be directing. The teacher interrupts the group work and tells Rhonda to help a boy. Then she stops Dominique from wandering around the room. She questions Dominique about her inappropriate behavior. She says, "What are you supposed to be doing when you have a question?" Dominique says, "Raise your hand." The teacher repeats, "Raise your hand, <u>not</u> walk around." Dominique and the other four students who are standing quickly sit down. The time is 9:30. A boy comes up to the teacher and she checks his work between her lecture to the group. The teacher writes on the board by the round table as she demonstrates to the class. She has the students point to the box on the paper. She says, "What did I say to do, Kelly?" He points to the box on the paper. She says, "All right, what number do we put in the box?" There is a chorus of, "Three." The teacher says, "Why?" The students chorus, "There are three groups of 10." She says, "Right." She goes on with the instructions at 9:33.

In this teacher's second excerpt she manages the transition into the math activity for both groups simultaneously. The teacher's monitoring ability is apparent, as well as her specific feedback to students who have not followed instructions and her insistence on students correctly following procedures. The teacher also provides evidence of being able to match instructional demands to student capabilities. Her instruction is differentiated by groups and she has a student helping other students. As a contrasting case, consider the excerpt below, also from a first grade class but in this case from a less effective manager. The observation was made on the fourth day of school and begins shortly after lunch.

> The teacher walks back to the overhead and puts three tokens on the overhead which casts a shadow of three members of the set. The teacher says, "David, what number is this?" David has been called on twice at this time. David calls out the correct answer, three. Three students call out also at the same time with the correct answer. The teacher says, "Who called out the number?" Sammy is now standing over by Shane's place. Shane points out to the teacher that Wayne is out of his seat and the teacher says, "Wayne, go back to your seat." She gets up and writes "Wayne" on the blackboard. The teacher says, "This is a new set." Out of 25 students in the room, 11 are participating with the teacher. They hold up their folders with the correct number. As the numbers get harder more students are participating. For threes and twos, very few students participated. Wayne is now counting out loud. Martha calls out, "What number is that? Eight?" The teacher says, "No. Nine." Wayne comes up to the teacher and says, "Why don't we do zero?" The teacher then puts four tokens up. There is much conversation in the room. It's very hard to follow everything. The teacher says, "Shane, let's not say the number out loud." The teacher calls on Mark, "What's the number?" Mark answers, "Three." The teacher says, "I don't see your folder," meaning that Mark is not holding up his answer folder. The teacher says, "What is the next number?" The teacher forges ahead. Most of the students can find the correct number and put it in the folder. They are academically able to do this task. The teacher says, "That was just great. Shh, quiet. I didn't say to start talking." There is much conversation in the room. The teacher gets up and goes to her desk and picks up some papers. At this moment Seth turns around and hits the little boy next to him. The teacher says, "I will come by and pick up your folders.

Please remain in your seats." There is much movement and conversation. The teacher moves Seth to the desk which is by the overhead, an isolated desk. She talks to him very softly. She turns her back on him and Seth proceeds to dance around the overhead at least twice. The teacher has begun talking to other students and doesn't see him. Eventually he sits down. The teacher says, "I want you to write the numbers in this space." The extent of her instructions consisted of this sentence and perhaps one sentence the observer did not write down. Very few students were listening to the instructions. The teacher then says, "Does everyone understand?" Nobody has a question. The teacher moves through the room picking up the folders, and she has given the paper to a student to be distributed. Seth is back in his usual desk. At this time five people are out of their seats. Seth says, "Teacher, what are we supposed to do?" The teacher comes over to him and talks to him very quietly. Four students have their hands up waiting for the teacher to give them some attention. Five people are talking. The teacher says, "If you have time you may color your paper." The teacher in a few seconds says, "You may put your name at the top." Nicole gets up from her desk and comes over with her paper, shows the teacher her paper, and the teacher says, "That's very good." Three boys are at the sink washing their hands. The teacher calls Shane down and asks him to sit back down. Two people still have their hands up. The teacher says, "David?" David says, "Teacher, I need a pencil." The teacher puts the folders on her desk. Approximately half of the students are working. The teacher goes back to the sink area. Bart has no paper or pencil. In a moment he gets them out of his desk. He had had them hidden in his desk. The teacher says, "Wait a minute. A lot of you people are not listening to instructions. People are asking a lot of questions. You can color <u>after</u> you have written the numbers. Now don't come and ask me if you can color." A student calls out, "What do we have to color?"

In this excerpt we see some signs of the teacher's behavior being affected by the disruption occurring in the class. The interruptions give a discontinuous feel to the flow of instruction, and may have caused the teacher to curtail her explanations. Much inappropriate behavior is not attended to or is only dealt with after it becomes very visible. The teacher is not very clear in her directions about the assignment and consequently students become confused. No procedures seem to be in place to handle movement around the room, callouts, and

social interaction. Finally, the teacher does not secure students' attention before beginning explanations.

Frequent sources of problems for less effective managers throughout the year are summarized below.

1. Out of seat students. Students frequently left their seats to wander around the room. Not only were such students disengaged, but they were a distraction to other students or, worse, a model for inappropriate behavior.

2. Excessive noise caused by student talk. This occurred both during seatwork and during teacher-led activities. In the latter case, the noise often was distracting to the teacher who sometimes interrupted the lesson to deal with it. These interruptions then caused discontinuities in the lesson that further contributed to a lack of student attention.

3. Interruptions of the teacher during presentations, recitations, or discussions by students. A common form of interruption was a call out (i.e., a comment or response to a question). Other kinds of interruptions occurred when students became engaged in loud conversations or left their seats to go up to the teacher to ask a question.

4. Delays in beginning activities. Some teachers failed to get all the students' attention, or to bring one activity to an end and get all the students to begin a new activity together. Sometimes long periods of time were needed for the class to make transitions. Common trouble points included the beginning of the day, returning from lunch, and transitions between major instructional activities.

Strategies that seemed to work for better managers can be grouped into a number of categories.

Procedures for transitions. Better managers had procedures for major transition points such as the beginning of school, before and after lunch, or between major instructional activities. Typically routine activities were scheduled, specific behaviors were expected of students at these times, and the teacher monitored carefully to see that they were carried out. Transitions between activities were often accomplished by the teachers giving students a warning that a transition was going to occur, getting everyone's attention at the point when the preceding activity was to stop, and then supervising closely while the students got ready for the next activity. It was also common for the teachers to use a signal for getting student attention at major transition points during instruction. Examples of signals included the teacher's turning lights off, clapping his or her hands together, ringing a bell, or using a standard verbal cue. Better managers did not generally use these signals simply to lower the noise level in the class, although this was a frequent practice of a number of the less effective managers.

Room use procedures. Features attended to explicitly by better managers included use of the bathroom (when located adjacent to the classroom), the pencil sharpener, and the drinking fountain or sink area. The most typical procedure was to allow students use of these facilities one at a time, as needed, with no permission necessary, as long as the teacher was not leading a whole class activity. Use of the bathroom was often regulated by some type of signal system (e.g., a laminated "boy" or "girl" pass.) A key element in these procedures was the "one at a time" requirement. This helped prevent excessive wandering and socializing during seatwork. The prohibition on these activi-

ties during teacher-led work prevented inattention in whole class activities. These procedures were generally described to students on the first day of school.

Regulation of student behavior during teacher-led instruction. These procedures in classes taught by effective managers usually included a requirement that students raise their hands during instructional activities in order to receive permission to speak. Call outs were generally not accepted, except when the teacher solicited chorus responses. In addition, social talk among students was not accepted during these times. If the teacher was interrupted, students were usually expected to sit quietly, to continue their work, or to rest their heads on their desks. Out of seat behavior was not accepted during teacher-led instruction except when specific permission was given. Typically these procedures were introduced during the first few days of instruction. During seatwork activities some common procedures included, in addition to the bathroom, drinking fountain, and pencil sharpening procedures described earlier, careful monitoring of the class before and during the teacher's instruction of a small group. Student talk during seatwork was not handled uniformly except for the expectation of no loud talking or noise. Some teachers expected students to work on their own with no interaction. Others allowed talk as long as the noise level was very low. A few seemed to enforce no talking during the first part of seatwork and relaxed the prohibition toward the end of the seatwork period. Early in the year, however, these teachers generally required silence during seatwork, relaxing the rule only after the first few weeks of classes, if then.

Expectations for general student conduct. In this area a wide variety of rules was evident among effective managers. No very distinctive or dominant pattern emerged in the area of respect for authority or prosocial behaviors such as cooperation, kindness, helpfulness, etc. However, the better managers more frequently and specifically prohibited agression (e.g., no horse play, do not hurt anyone, do not be disorderly, no tackling during play, etc.).

Consequences. Expectations regarding consequences were introduced early in the year by the better managers, and they had more of them. These were usually tied to specific behaviors, particularly when the consequence was a penalty. Examples included:

Isolation for a day for hitting;

Writing everything said for talking out;

Ignoring students who call out;

Loss of recess time for not working;

Time out for particular behaviors;

Copying a paragraph for breaking a rule.

When presented to students, positive consequences were less frequently tied to specific behaviors. Rather, they were used more often to reward overall good behavior and following of rules. Examples of positive consequences explicitly described to students during the first few days of instruction included:

Happy faces for good work;

Super-Star badge (or merit badge or honor badge) for good behavior;

Extra privileges;

Note home to parents to describe good behavior;

Quietest table gets to go first.

The better managers described more consequences at the beginning of the year. The narrative data also indicate that they used their consequences more often and when they did so usually gave specific feedback about why the reward or penalty was provided. The use of penalties was generally tied to some aspect of the teacher's system of rules and procedures when it was introduced during the first day or two of instruction. Several of the teachers in the better manager group as well as in the less effective group also used a penalty system in which a misbehaving student's name was written on the board as a warning. Subsequent misbehaviors earned the student a check which resulted in a penalty (e.g., detention). When the LE managers used this procedure, it did not work for several related reasons. They did not monitor adequately and thus did not detect misbehaviors. Furthermore, when they gave a warning or a check they were not specific about the reasons and frequently other students were off task or breaking the rules at the same time. For these teachers the use of a penalty system seemed to function more as a noise reduction technique than as a means of deterring specific behaviors. The inconsistent use of penalties eventually underminded their effectiveness as a deterent.

The emphasis by better managers on clear expectations for student behavior and maintaining an orderly environment does not appear to have been at the expense of a positive climate and may have contributed to it. The observers rated the three groups of classrooms as equivalent on the climate scale, "Relaxed, pleasant atmosphere," during early observations. During the January to March observations, however, the ME and E

groups were significantly higher on this variable than was the LE group.

Other important management variables. As the analyses of the observation data indicated and as the excerpts illustrate, careful monitoring of behavior was one of the characteristics associated with better management results. It is likely that poor monitoring was partly the result of high levels of inappropriate behavior that developed as the year went on, rather than only the teachers' insensitivity to the behavior. However, even at the beginning of the year the less effective teachers were noted as more frequently not responding to challenges (i.e., obvious violations of rules or procedures) than the other groups. This was indicated both by the component ratings as well as by examining specific instances of teacher behavior described in the narrative data. Proportionately more teacher responses to obvious inappropriate student behaviors were ignores or "doesn't see" for the LE teachers. Although better managers also were sometimes noted as ignoring or not seeing challenges, these were more likely to be "call out" events, for which no teacher response may be the best strategy. The response of the better managers to other challenges was quite varied including desists, citing rules and procedures, making nonverbal responses such as eye contact, telling students what behavior was expected, questioning students, using time out, and praising appropriate behavior. Of these, the first three listed were the most prevalent, sometimes in combination. Thus when some rule or procedure was violated in an obvious manner, the better managers more frequently dealt with it directly. However, there was no single type of response that seemed to predominate. This was the case at the beginning of the year and during mid-year observations.

Limitations

Several limitations should be recognized in the data and their interpretation. When interpreting Table 3, it should be kept in mind that the means are based upon 5-point scales and thus the differences among the groups are only relative and not absolute. That is, a difference among groups indicates that one or both groups exhibited more of the behaviors during the observations, but it does not indicate in any precise way how much more of the behaviors were exhibited. Table 4 variables reflect amounts or frequencies of occurrence, but they are not necessarily representative because time intervals were not randomly sampled. Thus, the finding that teachers in the more effective group spent 54 minutes during the first four observations on rules, procedures, and consequences does not yield a basis for identifying the total number of minutes spent by these teachers during the first 2 weeks of school. However, because the observation procedures were the same for teachers in all of these groups, the means may be interpreted comparatively. That is, better managers spent approximately three times as many minutes on rules, procedures, and consequences than did less effective managers. The data are correlational and several interpretations are possible. Furthermore, although frequently defined in behavorial terms, many of the measures of variables were ratings and these are more subject to observer bias than lower inference coding. Also, observers were responsible for assessing teacher behavior as well as determining the amount of disruptive behavior and the numbers of students engaged or off task. Thus, assessments of the levels of one set of variables may have been influenced by knowledge of the other set. In support of the data are the results from the lower inference assess-

ments of amounts of time spent on rules, procedures, and the number of consequences. These results are consistent with the higher inference assessments. Also, if any strong observer biases were present, they were unusually selective: Significant differences among the groups at the beginning of the year were found on a limited number of the teacher behavior variables and not on some high inference variables that would seem especially subject to halo (e.g., student success; class has relaxed, pleasant atmosphere).

Summary

The results from this study are consistent with a management model that emphasizes the teacher's active role in defining clear expectations for appropriate behavior in a number of important areas. This information is conveyed to students through a system of rules, procedures, and consequences that is taught at the beginning of the year. The structure that is established is maintained by the teacher's prompt management of disruption. A less well defined structure is associated with higher levels of disruption throughout the year. Student engagement is best predicted by variables that reflect a match between instructional tasks and activities and student capabilities. However, the structural features that inhibit disruption may support the teacher's instructional efforts. Management problems occur in a variety of areas and become chronic. Good managers prevent these problems from occurring both through their establishment of procedures, effective delivery of consequences, clear feedback to students about expected behavior, careful monitoring, prompt handling of inappropriate behavior, and clarity in directions and instruction.

Reference Notes

1. Filby, N. How teachers produce "Academic Learning Time": Instructional variables related to student engagement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

2. Emmer, E., Sanford, J., Evertson, C., Clements, B., and Martin, J. The Classroom Management Improvement Study: An experiment in elementary classrooms (R&D Rep. 6050). The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

References

Arlin, M. Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16, 42-56.

Benowitz, M., & Busse, T. Effects of material incentives on classroom learning over a four-week period. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1976, 68, 57-62.

Breuning, S. Precision teaching in the high school classroom: A necessary step towards maximizing teacher effectiveness and student performance. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 125-140.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Doyle, W. Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management. 78th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 2). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 1980, 80(5), 219-231.

Evertson, C. Differences in instructional activities in average and low achieving junior high classes. Elementary School Journal, in press.

Evertson, C., & Sanford, J., & Emmer, E. Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18(2), 219-232.

Good, T. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30(2), 52-64.

Good, T., & Beckerman, T. Time-on-task: A naturalistic study in sixth-grade classrooms. Elementary School Journal, 1978, 78, 193-201.

Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968.

Kounin, J. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Kounin, J., & Doyle, P. Degree of continuity of a lesson's signal system and the task involvement of children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67(2), 159-164.

Kounin, J., & Gump, P. Signal systems of lesson settings and the task related behavior of preschool children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 554-562.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Medley, D. Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Table 1

Correlations Between Management Criteria Means

During Observations in the First 8 Weeks

And January-February (n = 41)

	r	$p <$
Disruptive behavior	.57	.001
Off-task, unsanctioned	.49	.002
On task	.46	.003

Table 2

Correlation of Teacher Behaviors and Activities

with Measures of Disruption and Task Engagement

Management Variables	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
1. Readying the Classroom		
Materials are ready (CR1c)	-.25	.55
Suitable traffic patterns (CR2a)	-.28	.44
Degree of visibility (CR2b)	-.19	.45
Adequate storage is provided in the first week of school for students' belongings (AdCR7)	.20	.17
In terms of equipment and supplies, teacher was ready for the first week of school (ORT17)	-.26	.43
In first week of school, room orderly, well-organized; materials/props available and in place (NRR1)	-.24	.65
In first week of school, student name tags used effectively (NRR2)	-.21	.18
2. Rules and Procedures		
Efficient administrative routines (CR3a)	-.39	.70
Appropriate general procedures (CR3b)	-.68	.65

Notes. Table 2 is adapted from Emmer, et al (Note 2)

CR = Component Ratings; AdCR = Addendum Component Ratings; ORT = Fourth-week Observer Ratings of Teachers; NRR = Narrative Reader Ratings.

A single underscore indicates $p < .05$; a double underscore indicates $p \leq .01$.

35

Table 2, Continued

	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Efficient small group procedures (CR3c)	-.69	.53
Uses warm-up or wind-down activities (CR3e)	-.18	.31
Come-ups observed while teacher engaged with other students or lessons (ORT7)	.60	-.20
Students call out without raising hands (ORT13)	.77	-.44
Sufficient number and scope of workable procedures and rules for small group activities (NRR13)	-.25	.52
Sufficient number and scope of workable procedures for whole-class activities (NRR14)	-.44	.50
Problems related to movement of students in classroom (NRR29)	.47	-.61
Problems related to class verbal participation (NRR30)	.43	-.46
3. Consequences		
Teacher rewards appropriate performance (CR5a)	-.14	+.44
Teacher rewards appropriate behavior consistently (NRR16)	-.32	.55
Negative consequences clearly defined (NRR17)	-.15	.22
Teacher follows through with negative consequences consistently (NRR18)	-.30	.46
System of consequences appropriate and effective (NRR19)	-.42	.57

36

Table 2, Continued

	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
4. Teaching Rules and Procedures and First Week of School Activities		
Teacher presents, reviews, or discusses classroom rules or procedures in the first week of school (AdCR1)	-.20	.12
Presentation of rules, procedures, and penalties in the first week of school is clear (AdCR2)	-.43	.17
Presentation in the first week of school includes explanation of rationale for rules and procedures (AdCR3)	-.17	.05
Rehearsal or practice of procedures is included for presentation/ review of rules and procedures in the first week of school (AdCR4)	-.17	-.02
Teacher provides feedback and review of rules and procedures during the first week of school (AdCR5)	-.37	.10
Teacher stays in charge of all students in the first week of school (AdCR6)	-.18	.18
Procedures and rules well-taught: Presentation, review, reminders, corrections (NRR15)	-.30	.39
5. Monitoring		
Effective monitoring (CR5d)	-.42	.70
Teacher effectively monitors at beginning of activities (NRR21)	-.30	.53

37

Table 2, Continued

	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
Effective monitoring of transitions (NRR22)	-.36	.55
Problems related to contacting teacher for help, attention (NRR31)	.36	-.18
6. Stopping Inappropriate Behavior		
Consistency in managing behavior (CR5c)	-.65	.61
Stops disruptive pupil behavior quickly (CR6c)	-.43	.48
Cites rules or procedures in response to disruptive behavior (CR6d)	-.06	.08
Ignores disruptive behavior (CR6h)	.09	-.29
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly (CR7c)	-.60	.59
Cites rules or procedures in response to inappropriate behavior (CR7d)	.11	.23
Signals appropriate behavior (CR5b)	-.05	.36
Students with behavioral disturbances are handled well (ORT15)	-.52	.33
Ignores inappropriate student behavior (CR7h)	.41	-.49
Ignores inappropriate behavior when ignoring is appropriate (NRR20)	-.38	.26

Table 2, Continued

	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
7. Organizing Instruction		
Attention spans considered in lesson (CR4b)	-.36	.74
Student success (CR4c)	-.49	.75
Teacher allows activity to continue too long (ORT20)	.10	-.49
Manages interruptions (CR9e)	-.40	.40
Problems related to school-wide scheduling (NRR35)	.07	-.08
Appropriate pacing of lesson (CR1h)	-.58	.68
8. Student Accountability		
Teacher monitors student understanding (CR1j)	-.43	.72
Teacher consistently enforces work standards (CR1k)	-.66	.68
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, collecting work (CR3d)	-.53	.61
Teacher successful in maintaining students' responsibility for work (ORT24)	-.39	.41
Deadlines enforced consistently (NRR9)	-.32	.40
Effectively monitors student progress and completion of assignments (NRR11)	-.38	.47
When task avoidance occurs, teacher successfully intervenes (NRR23)	-.46	.59

39

Table 2, Continued

	Disruptive Behavior	On-task
9. Clarity		
Describes objectives clearly (CR1a)	-.38	.62
Clear directions (CR1d)	-.61	.73
Clear explanations and presentations (CR1i)	-.61	.72
In giving directions, teacher questions to determine students' understanding (ORT23)	-.28	.43
Students' problems with curriculum are anticipated, explanations are appropriate in vocabulary, level of complexity (NRR3)	-.38	.64

Table 3

Means of Three Groups of Classroom Managers, Week 1 Component Ratings

Variable	More Effective (n = 6)	Effective (n = 6)	Less Effective (n = 6)	Within Group Variance	F
Describes objectives clearly	3.4	3.7	2.8	.84	1.68
Materials are ready	4.4	3.7	3.9	.84	.90
Clear directions	4.4	4.0	3.0	.59	5.16*
Waits for attention	4.4	4.3	3.3	.82	2.68
Appropriate pacing of lessons	3.6	3.9	3.0	.69	1.71
Clear explanations and presentations	3.9	4.5	3.2	.93	2.47
Monitors student understanding	4.1	4.0	3.1	.82	2.36
Consistently enforces work standards	3.7	4.3	3.4	.99	1.09
Suitable traffic patterns	4.5	4.0	3.8	.22	3.90*
Degree of visibility	4.2	4.3	4.1	.72	.06
Efficient administrative routines	3.9	3.7	3.0	.60	2.11
Appropriate general procedures	4.2	4.1	2.9	.54	5.14*

Table 3, continued

Variable	More Effective (n = 6)	Effective (n = 6)	Less Effective (n = 6)	Within Group Variance	F
Suitable routines for assigning, checking, collecting work	3.8	3.8	3.2	.24	3.13
Uses warm-up or wind-down activities	2.8	2.7	2.3	1.19	.44
Student agression	1.3	1.3	1.7	.51	.56
Attention spans considered in lesson	3.7	3.9	3.1	.81	1.38
Student success	4.0	3.9	3.7	.22	.65
Rewards appropriate performance	3.8	3.6	2.7	1.07	1.99
Signals appropriate behavior	4.0	3.6	2.7	1.62	1.64
Consistency in managing behavior	4.3	3.8	2.8	.71	4.76*
Effective monitoring	4.0	3.9	3.2	.52	1.98
Amount of disruption	1.3	1.8	2.5	.38	6.54**
Stops disruption quickly	4.2	4.1	2.6	.91	4.34*
Cites rules or procedures to stop disruption	2.3	3.3	2.5	2.17	.44
Punishes or criticizes to stop disruptions	1.5	1.9	1.7	.83	.15

Table 3, continued

Variable	More Effective (n = 6)	Effective (n = 6)	Less Effective (n = 6)	Within Group Variance	F
Ignores disruption	1.3	2.8	2.5	1.17	1.67
Amount of inappropriate behavior	2.4	2.9	3.5	.33	5.83*
Stops inappropriate behavior quickly	4.5	3.7	2.7	.57	8.15**
Cites rules or procedures to stop inappropriate behavior	3.7	3.6	2.4	1.47	1.99
Uses nonverbal contact to stop inappropriate behavior	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.28	.03
Punishes or criticizes to stop inappropriate behavior	1.3	1.5	1.6	.36	.33
Ignores inappropriate behavior	2.0	2.4	3.6	.54	8.15**
Class has task-oriented focus	4.3	3.8	3.2	.64	2.90
Class has relaxed, pleasant atmosphere	4.1	3.9	3.6	.26	1.28
Teacher displays listening skills	3.9	3.9	3.3	.49	1.53
Teacher expresses feelings	3.3	3.5	2.0	1.08	3.90*
Manages interruptions	4.8	3.9	3.4	.77	4.24*
Teacher presents, reviews, or discusses rules or procedures	3.6	3.6	2.4	.91	3.34

Table 3, continued

Variable	More Effective (n = 6)	Effective (n = 6)	Less Effective (n = 6)	Within Group Variance	F
Presentation of rules, procedures and penalties is clear	4.0	4.4	2.9	.93	3.82*
Presentation includes explanation of rationale for rules and procedures	3.6	3.8	2.2	.88	4.61*
Rehearsal or practice of procedures	3.1	3.4	2.5	1.21	1.03
Teacher provides feedback and review for rules/ procedures	4.3	4.3	2.7	.60	8.56**
Teacher stays in charge of all students, avoiding long involvement with individuals or small groups and absence from room	4.3	4.3	3.5	.69	1.69
Adequate convenient storage is provided for supplies and students' belongings	3.9	4.2	3.7	.90	.53

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

Note--Ratings are on a 1 to 5 scale: 1 = Behavior never occurs or is not at all characteristic; 3 = Behavior occurs occasionally or is somewhat characteristic; 5 = Behavior occurs frequently or is highly characteristic of the teacher.

Table 4

Means of Three Manager Groups, Supplementary Narrative Variables

Variable	More Effective (n = 6)	Effective (n = 6)	Less Effective (n = 6)	Within Group Variance	F
Minutes on Rules Procedures, Consequences	54.3	66.2	22.2	717.1	4.34*
Consequence Events	4.5	4.0	1.2	4.3	4.52*
Challenges	10.0	20.5	21.8	100.6	2.51
Desists	26.0	30.0	35.5	309.0	.66
Affective Activities	1.3	1.0	.7	1.9	.35

*$p \leq .05$

Note--Data are based on four observations during the first 2 weeks of school.